



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,607	09/21/2006	Takeo Yajima	4724-0038WOUS	1929
35301 7590 08/03/2010 MCCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP CITY PLACE II 185 ASYLUM STREET HARTFORD, CT 06103				
EXAMINER				
HILTON, ALBERT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1716				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/03/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/593,607

Applicant(s)

YAJIMA, TAKEO

Examiner

Albert Hilton

Art Unit

1716

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/22/2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4, 10-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/22)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a first action on the merits. Claims 1-12 are pending. Claims 1-4 and 10-12 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 9 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima (US Patent Application No. 20020131875) in view of Isogai (US Patent No. 6736900), Kawata (US Patent No. 4932353), and Butler (US Patent Application No. 20050139344).

2. Regarding claim 9, Yajima describes an apparatus in which a chemical liquid accommodated in a chemical liquid tank (**tank 3**) is dispensed from a nozzle (**nozzle 18**) of a nozzle body (Yajima: paragraph 47, Fig. 2), the apparatus comprising:

3. a pump (**pump 16**) having an elastically deformable and tube-shaped flexible film (**flexible tube 24**) forming a pump room, whose one end communicates with a primary-side chemical liquid flow path (**return path 19**) communicating with the chemical liquid tank and whose other end communicates with a secondary-side chemical liquid flow path (**delivery path 17**) communicating with the nozzle body (**18**) (Yajima: paragraphs 52, 56-57, and Fig. 4), wherein when the flexible film (**24**) expands the volume of the pump room (**16**), the liquid in the liquid tank (**3**) is sucked into the pump room (**16**), and when the flexible film shrinks the volume of the pump room (**16**), the liquid in the pump room is dispensed to the nozzle body (**18**) (Yajima: paragraphs 57, 60-61, and Fig. 4);
4. an assembly (**body 1**), in which the pump (**16**), a primary-side valve (**valve V5**) for opening/closing the primary-side chemical flow path (**19**), and a secondary-side valve (**valve V4**) for opening/closing the secondary-side chemical flow path (**17**) are provided (Yajima: paragraphs 51-52 and Figs. 2, 4). Yajima does not describe an apparatus in which the nozzle body is incorporated into the same assembly that houses the pump and valves (Yajima: Fig. 2). However, Isogai teaches the use of an assembly (**dispenser unit 30**) that comprises both a pump (**screw pump 94**) and a nozzle body (**nozzle 90**) (Isogai: column 6, lines 50-55, column 11, lines 5-9 and Fig. 3). Isogai further teaches that the incorporation of the pump and nozzle in the same assembly improves fluid delivery by preventing flow resistance arising from a change in feeding direction (Isogai: column 3, lines 13-22). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention, motivated by a desire to reduce the flow resistance in the apparatus of Yajima would therefore have found it obvious to place the nozzle and pump into one assembly.

5. Further regarding claim 9, Yajima does not describe a double tube comprising an internal tube containing the primary-side chemical liquid flow path, and an external tube in which the internal tube is disposed and in which temperature control water flows, as well as a return path for the temperature control water (see Kawata: Fig. 3).

6. However, Kawata teaches that, in a chemical dispensing apparatus, it is desirable to provide an external tube with temperature-control water along the internal tube (flow path) of the chemical in order to keep the dispensed chemical at a desired viscosity (Kawata: column 3, lines 38-47, column 4, lines 12-28).

7. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, desiring to supply the chemical in the apparatus of Yajima with a controlled viscosity, would therefore have found it obvious to add an external tube to the apparatus of Yajima in view of Isogai.

8. The operation of the heat-exchanging external tube of Kawata requires that the external tube be placed in close proximity to the inner tube in order for heat transfer to occur. One of ordinary skill in the art would therefore have found it obvious to locate the external tube within the pump assembly such that the temperature-controlled water flow path is formed in the pump.

9. Further regarding claim 9, Yajima in view of Isogai and Kawata describes an external tube for temperature-controlled water surrounding an internal flow path for a dispensed chemical in a pump assembly, but does not describe a coupling block with a

branch that causes the temperature control water from the external tube to flow into the temperature control water flow path.

10. However, Butler teaches a coupling block (**T-adapter 6**) wherein a branching path causes one liquid (**cooling fluid 13**) from an external tube to couple with the flow path of a second liquid (**inlet 28**) to facilitate a heat exchange in an apparatus (**tank 22**) (Butler: paragraphs 12, 16, and Fig. 4). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, desiring to couple the temperature-controlled water and the chemical flow path in the pump assembly of Yajima in view of Isogai and Kawata, would therefore have found it obvious to make use of the coupling block of Butler to join the two flow paths in the prior art apparatus.

11. Regarding claim 5, Yajima in view of Isogai, Kawata, and Butler teaches an apparatus wherein a flexible film (**24**) is expanded by decreasing the pressure of a driving medium (**pressure fluid**) and shrunk by increasing the pressure of the driving medium (Yajima: paragraph 62 and Fig. 8).

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima in view of Isogai, Kawata, and Butler as applied to claims 9 and 5 above, and further in view of Kawano (US Patent No. 6258167).

12. Regarding claim 6, Yajima in view of Isogai, Kawata, and Butler does not teach a movable arm connected to a nozzle assembly. However, Kawano discloses a chemical supply apparatus having a nozzle assembly (**20**) attached to a movable arm (**movable member 34**) (Kawano, column 1, lines 48-50, and Kawano, Figures 4 and 6). Kawano teaches that using a movable arm to deposit material in a coating apparatus to coat the

entire length of a substrate and to maintain a constant height above the substrate results in a coating film having uniform thickness. (Kawano, column 4, lines 37-45 and column 5, lines 1-10). One of ordinary skill in the art, motivated by a need to precisely control the thickness of a film deposited by the apparatus of the Yajima in view of Isogai, Kawata, and Butler, would have found it obvious to improve upon the apparatus of the combined references by placing the dispensing pump inside a movable arm.

13. Regarding claim 7, Yajima in view of Isogai, Kawata, and Butler teaches a driving device (**fluid supply source 40**) for increasing and decreasing the pressure of the driving medium (**pressure fluid**) with which the driving room is filled (Yajima: paragraph 62 and Fig. 8). The driving device (**40**) and driving room (**chamber 39**) are connected to each other via a tube (**fluid channel 41**) through which the driving medium flows (Yajima: paragraph 62 and Figs. 7-8). The combined references show that the pressurization room (**39**) and driving device (**40**) are at separate locations (Yajima: Fig. 7), but do not explicitly teach that the driving device (**40**) is located at a position other than the arm. However, the location of the driving device (**40**), either on or off the movable arm, would not affect the operation of the apparatus in a patentably distinct way, and would therefore represent a rearrangement of parts that would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention (see MPEP 2144.04).

14. **Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima in view of Isogai, Kawata, Butler, and Kawano as applied to claims 6-7**

above, and in further in view of Fedulov (Fedulov, A. I., Journal of Mining Science, 1979, vol 15, pp. 54-65).

15. 14. Regarding claim 8, Yajima in view of Isogai, Kawata, Butler, and Kawano teaches an apparatus in which the driving medium (**pressure fluid**) of the flexible film (**24**) is expanded by decreasing the volume of the medium in the driving room (**39**), and the flexible film (**24**) is shrunk by increasing the volume of the incompressible medium (Yajima: paragraph 62 and Fig. 8). The combined references do not specify that the medium is incompressible. However, it is well-known in the art that incompressible fluids transfer pressure quickly as compared to compressible media, as is taught by Fedulov (Fedulov, page 2, paragraph 1). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, would therefore have found it prima facie obvious to choose an incompressible fluid as a driving medium, with the reasonable expectation that such a design choice would allow for quick pressure transfer from the driving device to the driving room.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant argues that it would have been possible to use the flexible film of Yajima as the inner tube of a double-tube heat exchanger, as such a configuration would require the incompressible medium, acting as a heat-exchange medium, to be subjected to heating and cooling, with thermal expansion of the liquid requiring a surge tank. The examiner agrees with this argument, but maintains that it would be obvious to add the external tube of the heat exchanger around the compression chamber of

Yajima, such that the compression medium is a different medium than the temperature-control medium.

17. The applicant argues that Kawata reference demonstrates a long-felt need that is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The examiner maintains that Kawata explicitly teaches the advantages of providing a temperature-controlled external tube in a chemical dispensing apparatus, namely that such an addition would allow for the viscosity and thickness of the deposited coating liquid to be controlled.

18. Applicant argues that the previous action fails to demonstrate that it would be obvious to incorporate the nozzle and pump into one assembly body. The examiner asserts that the Isogai reference teaches the advantages of such an arrangement, as explained in detail above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Albert Hilton whose telephone number is (571)-270-5519. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571)-272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Albert Hilton/
Examiner, Art Unit 1716

/Parviz Hassanzadeh/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1716